ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು. ನೀವು ಏನು motion ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದು ಇನ್ನೂ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು allow ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಅಥವಾ disallow ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. That does not arise now. The Minister can make a statement at any time.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ವೆಂಕಟೇ ಗೌಡ.—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆನ್ನುವ ಆಧಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಬಹುದು. ಆಗ ಅದರ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಇತ್ಯರ್ಥವಾಗುವವರೆಗೂ ಅದೇ ವಿಚಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ statement ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ನಾವು ಕಳಿಸಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ವಿಷಯ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That will be considered in due course.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I have also sent a call attention notice.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That will be considered and the House will be intimated.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವೆಂಕಟೇ ಗೌಡರು ಕೇಳಿದ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ? ನಿಲುವಳಿ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು allow ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಅಥವಾ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ನೀವು disallow ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅಥವಾ allow ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ. ನಾವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈಗ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡದೇ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಇಟ್ಟು, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಆದನಂತರ "I regret my inability to allow it in view of the statement made by the Minister" ಎಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಆಫೀಸಿನಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಪತ್ರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈಗಲೇ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಕೂಲಂಕಷವಾಗಿ ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಒಂದು procedure ಅನುಸರಿಸುವಾಗ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೆಕು. ಇದು ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುಂದೆ ಇದು precedent ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರವನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no object served in discussing it now. As regards the adjournment motion, I have already said that it will receive due consideration. The position now is that it has not either been disallowed or allowed. But that does not prevent the Minister from making a statement as per the rules.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The very object of submitting an adjournment motion would be defeated if the Minister is permitted to make a statement in advance on the same subject.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have heard the discussion carefully. Nothing more need be said. The Hon'ble Minister for Education will proceed with the statement.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—I rise to a point of order. When an issue on a particular subject-matter is pending consideration of the Chair, is it permissible for any Minister to make a statement in respect of the very same subject?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—When the Chair is yet to take a decision, the Minister is entitled to make a statement and the Speaker will in due course give his consideration to the notices given by the Members. There is nothing wrong in the Minister making a statement. This is my ruling and that is an end of the matter.

Statement

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, the total expenditure on the collegiate education is increasing...

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—On a point of order, Sir. Is the Minister in order if he replies to a subject matter which has been before the House in the form of an adjournment motion or a short-notice question or a Call Attention notice? There is an adjournment notice which is not yet disposed of and which is before the House. Is the Minister in order if he makes a statement on the same subject matter?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Leader of the Opposition presumes that the question of adjournment motion is before the House; It is not before the House. Notice of an adjournment motion is given to the Speaker or to the office and it may be allowed or may not be allowed. It may not come before the House at all. Simply because a motion is handed over to the office, it does not mean than the matter is before the House. It is under the consideration of the Speaker. The Speaker may allow the Minister to make a statement and the adjournment motion will be considered on its merit. That is my ruling.

†Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I want to draw the attention of the Chair to rule 50:

(SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA)

"Subject to the provisions of these rules, a motion for an adjournment of the business of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the Speaker."

Rule 51 says :

"Notice of an adjournment motion shall be given to the Secretary two hours before the commencement of the sitting on the day on which motion is proposed to be made".

Sir, we gave notice yesterday requesting permission of the Chair. This is so specific. After the question hour the Speaker said that the concerned Minister would make a statement. Now, you were pleased to observe that it would be considered.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The Hon'ble Member is misquoting.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I am not misquoting; it is not to mislead anybody. Sir, you have not given an opportunity to raise this issue. I request you once again to reconsider the matter whether the proposed statement which is now going to be made by the Education Minister will cover the adjournment motion or not.

†Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—Sir, we will have to take into consideration the chain of events. This morning immediately after the question hour, the Leader of the Opposition wanted to draw the attention of the House as well as the Chair to an urgent matter of public importance. At that time, the Speaker was pleased to observe that two other Hon'ble Members drew the attention of the Chair that there had been an adjournment motion given notice of. The Chair was pleased to observe that it had not come to his notice. According to the rule just now quoted by my friend, only two hours is just sufficient to draw the attention of the Chair. In this case, the Hon'ble Minister is making a statement with reference to the agitation of the students as a protest against the rise in the school fee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member should not discuss the subject matter of the adjournment-motion-at this stage.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, fortunately or unfortunately it is with reference to that subject matter that the Minister is making a statement now. So, what happens to the adjournment motion ? So, before the Hon'ble Minister makes a statement, I think, the Speaker owes a duty to this House to give his considered ruling in the matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—A ruling has already been given. Simply because the Minister makes a statement on the same issue, it does not mean that the adjournment motion will be necessarily disallowed; it may be allowed or may not be allowed; the matter will have to be considered. Unless the Chair gives its consent, the matter cannot be brought before the House. So, the Hon'ble Minister will make a statement. I do not allow any more discussion on this matter.

Sri C J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, I draw the attention of the Chair...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, order...

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Sir, I have sent a call attention notice ; I want a clarification at the hands of the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That does not arise now.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—The total expenditure on the collegiate education is increasing from year to year. Subsequent on the revision of the pay scale for the teaching staff

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, what is the statement ? He says this is a statement in connection with the agitation of the students but he is reading something else.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Please here it completely.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, the total expenditure on the Collegiate Education is increasing from year to year consequent on the rivision of scales of pay on the teaching staff and increased cost on equipment, buildings etc., which the rate of fees in Government Colleges have remained unchanged for over

a decade. With Government's increased commitments on compulsory Primary Education and broadbased free education concessions at the secondry education and fast-increasing number of secondary schools, it has become difficult for Government to bear such a high cost on Collegiate Education. The per capita cost on Collegiate Education in this State is higher than in the neighbouring State of Madras.

2. In the ex-Mysore area the fees in Government Colleges are the lowest as compared to those charged inGovernment Colleges in the integrated areas of Coorg and Madras-Karnatak, though all these Colleges in those areas are affiliated to one and the same University *viz.*, the Mysore University. There were representations from Madras-Karnatak area and Coorg against charging higher rates of fees though the Colleges are affiliated to Mysore University.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. Is the Minister permitted to make a statement over and over again? He is making the same statement again. Is he in order in wasting the time of the House if he repeats the statement which he has already made?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I am making another statement. The further statement will make the position quite clear.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER —There is no point of order since the Minister says that it is not the same thing.

(Sri C. J. Muckannappa was found laughing).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble member should not laugh at the Chair's remarks. That does not add to the dignity of the House.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, how do you presume that I laughed at you? So many members are laughing. The Minister is laughing. It would be very difficult if I were to have an Aligarh lock put to my mouth and if I were to shut my eyes.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Don't shut your eyes and don't shut your mouth.

3. It is not possible to bring down the rates in Madras-Karnatak area and Coorg to the level of the pre-revision rates in ex-Mysore area because of the increasing cost of Collegiate Education already explained above. Moreover, in the same State there cannot be such a wide variation in the rates of fees in the areas covered by the two Universities *viz.*, Karnatak University and Mysore University. In order to avoid any discrimination, the rates of fees have to be more or less the same. The revised fees are on par with those prevailing in Madras and Andhra Pradesh. A Statement showing the fees prevailing in those States and the revised fees in Mysore is attached.

4. In order to do away with this anomaly and to have a uniform fee structure for all Government Colleges affiliated to the same University and also to meet atleast in very small proportion the increase in the cost on Collegiate Education, it was considered necessary to enhance the tuition fees in Government Colleges in ex-Mysore area which had remained unchanged for over a decade. It may also be mentioned that the rates of fees levied in Government College under the Karnatak University are already higher and the revised rates are not thus made applicable to College affiliated to that University.

5. Primary Education is free at present. Secondary Education is also free in respect of students whose parents' income per annum is less than Rs. 2,400. In giving this concession, Government is put to a loss of fee income to the extent of Rs. 73.60 lakhs per year. The cost on account of free education concession at secondary education level will increase year by year with the increase of student population. The concessions at Rs. 2,400 income level would benefit 87 per cent of students at the Secondary Education level and would cover the children of the N.G.O.s as well.

6. Some brief statistics regarding the increased expenditure borne by Government in Government Arts and Secince Colleges will indicate how far

(SRI S. R. KANTHI)

the commitments of Governments in creating facilities for higher education have increased. Similarly, Government are bearing additional increased expenditure every year towards financial assistance by way of grants to non-government Arts and Science Colleges.

†Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigere).—On a point of order. He is making a statement on the floor of the House, which is not included in the agenda put down for the day. Rule 27 says:

> "On days allotted for the transaction of Government business such business shall have precedence and the Secretary shall arrange that business in such order as the Speaker may, in consultation with the Leader of the House determine:"
>
> "Provided that such order of business shall not be varied on the day that business is set down for disposal unless the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation."

In fact, the reason for the variation has not been made known to this House. Unless this is made known to the House, this House cannot allow the Minister to make a statement on the floor of the House and also to deviate from the allotted business of the House.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I submit that I am almost at the end of my statement. The point of order ought to have come early, The point of order has come when I am about to finish my statement and it is too late now and it cannot be entertained, a part from rule 31(3).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—A point of order can be raised at any stage. But as regards rule 27 to which the Honourable Member has referred, it specifically lays down that if the Speaker is satisfied that there is sufficient ground for such variation, he can allow it. I would draw the attention of my honourable friend to rule 306.

> "A statement may be made by a Minister on a matter of public importance with the consent of the Speaker, but no question shall be asked at the time the statement is made."

A statement can be made by a Minister at any time with the consent of the Speaker. That is allowed under rule 27 also. With the consent of the Speaker a Minister can make a statement at any time. The Honourable Minister has been permitted to do so. So there is no point of order.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Expenditure on Government Arts and Science Colleges:—

1960–61	(Accounts)	Rs. 26.05	lakhs
1961–62	(Budget)	Rs. 45.54	,,
1961–62	(Revised)	Rs. 44.38	,,
1962–63	(Budget)	Rs. 54.22	,,

Expenditure of Grants to non-Government Arts and Science Colleges.

1960-61	(Accounts)	Rs. 4.63	lakhs
1961–62	(Budget)	Rs. 14.66	,,
1961–62	(Revised)	Rs. 14.66	,,
1962–63	(Budget)	Rs. 16.00	,,

7. Viewed in this context and considering the scale of fees prevailing in the neighbouring States and in the region of the Karnatak University, the increase in fees is not considerable. It must be stated here that Government continue to give freeships and half-freeships to the poor students in Government colleges and if we take into account the several scholarships, free ships and half free ships awarded to students, approximately 50 per cent of the students are benefitted by these fee concessions which should show that atleast approximately 50 per cent of the students would pay only half of the increased fees.

8. In view of the facts stated above and in view of the compelling large expenditure on all aspects of education and the future things to come, I am sure that the members of the Ligislature and people of State will appreciate the stand of the Government and deprecate the agitation that is going on. I am equally certain that people will back up the Government in its programme of march ahead.

STATEMENT SHOWING EXISTING SCALES OF FEES IN DIFFERENT AREAS OF THE STATE, IN ANDHRA PRADESH AND THOSE NOW SANCTIONED BY GOVERNMENT

Courses	Existing rate in Government Colleges			Madras rate prevailing in Govt. Colleges	Karnatak University.	Rates prevailing in Govt. Colleges in Andhra Pradesh	Revised rates of fees sanctionep from current academic year.
	In colleges taken over from Mysore University	In Mangalore and Mercara Colleges affiliated to Mysore University	In Gulbarga to Karnatak Colleges affiliated University				
Pre-University Arts & Commerce.	Rs. 90 per year	Rs. 144 per year	Rs. 140 per year.	Rs. 144 per year.	Rs. 180 per year (PUC Arts). Rs. 200 per year (PUC. Com.)	Rs. 144 per year.	Rs. 144 per year
Pre-University Science	Rs. 90 *plus* 27 lb. fee per year.	Rs. 144 *plus* lab. fee Rs. 10 for Science.	Rs. 140 *plus* lab. fee 15.	Rs. 144 *plus* Rs. 10 spl. fee per yr.	Rs. 180 plus Rs.40 lab. fee per year	Rs. 144 per year.	Rs. 144 per year *plus* lab. fee of Rs. 10 per yr.
Degree B.A. or B.Com.	Rs. 126 per year	Rs. 144 I year Degree Class Rs. 183 II & III yr. degree Classes	Rs. 140	Rs. 183 per year.	Rs. 180 per year (B.A.) Rs. 200 per year (B Com)	Rs. 183 per year.	Rs. 184 per year
B.Sc.	Rs. 126 per year (subjects which have no practical work). Rs. 162 per year (Subject which have practical work of Laboratory).	Rs. 144 *plus* Rs. 10 lab. fee I year. Degree Class; Rs. 183 *plus* Rs. 12 lab. fee for II and III year degree Classes.	Rs. 140 *plus* Rs. 15 lab. fee.	Rs. 183 per year. Rs. 12 spl. fee.	Rs. 180 per year *plus* Rs. 50 lab. fee in the Ist year and Rs. 80, in the II and III year.	Rs. 183 per year.	Rs. 184 per year *plus* lab. fee of Rs. 12 per year.
M.A.	Rs. 144 per year	...	...	Rs. 250 per year.	Rs. 180 per year	Information not available	Rs. 256 per year for M.A.,
M.Sc.	Rs. 144 *plus* Rs.45 lab. fee per year	...	...	Rs. 250 *plus* spl. fee of Rs.15 per year.	Rs. 240 per year	...	Rs. 256 per year for M.Sc. *plus* lab. fee of Rs.15 per year

4-00 P.M.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Please give us the teacher-pupil ratio in Andhra Pradesh and Madras. Also what is the scale of pay of Lecturers there ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I invite the attention of the hon'ble members to rule 306. No clarification can be asked.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, this is a burning topic. You must kindly permit me to ask some clarification.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—On how many points do you want to seek clarification ? The rule expressly prohibits putting any question.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—We are not discussing the statement The statement made has got some irrelevancies. He says that there is no rise of fee in the Government Colleges for over decades. Does he want us to take that incorrect statement ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You can take it for what it is worth. Under the rules you are prohibited from putting any question or seeking clarification.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Under rule 306 are we not entitled to know what is the statement he is making? He has made three statements which conflict with each other. With due deference to the Chair I want to submit that we should be permitted to seek some clarifications. Otherwise why are we here ? Why waste of money ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—You cannot say like that.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, whatever I point out you say that I should not mention this and that. What is wrong with me ? The Education Minister has committed a mess in the whole country and we are not in a position to raise our head.

†Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Minister for Labour, Housing and Transport).—A statement is made. Rules are there governing them. If our friends find any irrelevancy or raise any objection, with regard to facts and figures, they have so many other ways open to them to bring them before the House. There is also an adjournment motion before you upon which you are likely to take a decision. There are several opportunities wherein our friends can equally intervene and say what they want. In the absence of any provision in the rule...

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, the Hon'ble Minister for Labour and Transport said that the adjournment motion would be allowed tomorrow and that we could thve our say. Is it clearly understood that the adjournment motion will be taken up tomorrow ? I want to know whether there will be a discussion on the same subject either to-day or tomorrow. If not, you must allow us to seek carifications and to put questions.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—The rule does prohibit getting clarifications at the hands of the Government. It only prohibits putting questions. There is no fun in simply listening to the statement and going away.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Rule 306 is quite clear. No questions can be allowed. There is no discretion left to the Chair.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Chair has abundant powers. We are not putting any question.
One matter was made clear to the House, but we are not given permission to seek clarification. That is all our grievance. Some apprehension is working in our mind. If the remarks made are clear, we would have gladly accepted the ruling given by the Chair. Why is this variation ? You do not make it clear.

Sri D. M. SIDDIAH (Biligere).—On a point of order. The Hon'ble Minister has made a statement. I want to know from the Chair whether discussion is allowed on the subject.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—We are seeking permission of the Chair for some clarification.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಸಿದ್ದಯ್ಯ (ಬನ್ನೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ದಿನ ತಾವು ಏನು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಅದರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಇವತ್ತು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ನಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಏನೊಂದು ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಈ ದಿನ ಇದೆ ಆ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸುವ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಸಭಾತ್ಯಾಗ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—How can the Hon'ble Member make a statement ?

(*The Hon'ble Members of the Opposition staged a walk-out*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Coming to the business of the day *viz.*, Demands for Grants—Sri Shivappa is not here. Sri Suryanarayana Rao may speak.

BUDGET FOR 1962-63—VOTING OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

Demand No. 24, 28, and 44.

(*Debate continued*).

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO (Mysore City).—Sir, I stand to support the motion before the House in granting the respective sums prayed for. But while lending my support, I would like to offer a few suggestions for the consideration of the Government. Sir, this is an age of planning and development. The State Government has been making its best efforts to progress from stage to stage and bring prosperity to the country and the people as quickly as possible. But the development contemplated in the development plans is an integrated development on all sides. But from a reading of the Third Five-Year plan as given to us of the State Government, I find that the development of this side, *i.e.*, industries, is not keeping pace with the development in other spheres. Sir, I draw your attention to the plan, the Third Five Year Plan given to us, which lays down the policy of the State Government for the next five years. Sir, this Five-Year plan does not give one new item of development for the next five years Sir, in the Second Five-Year Plan, several provisions were made and efforts were made to start industries under the Second Five Year Plan. But under the Third Five Year Plan, we have no programme of further development. It is only the continuation of the programme of the Second Plan and there is no programme for the Third Plan. That only suggests, Sir, that the programme envisaged for the Third Plan is all the programme for the Third Plan we have. Sir, I would like to read the portion where the development programme is given under the Five Year Plan. It only gives a list of fifteen industries where development is proposed. None of them is a new industries. That is only with regard to industry in existence in Mysore today and which have been in existence for the past 25 years.....

Sri B. D. JATTI.—If the Hon'ble Member yields, does he want more industries than what we have to implement during the Third Five Year Plan?

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—That is exactly my point. It is not only sufficient to keep the industries going. This is a stage where it is a race between State and State in the matter of industrial development. It is a race in industrialisation.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Sir, we are discussing the Budget of the current year. The preparation of the Third Five-Year Plan is not under discussion. That stage is over. If he says that we have not implemented certain industries which were included then, there is some point.

Sri K.S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I am not discussing the Third Five Year Plan today. My only object ...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If it is relevant, you can bring it under discussion, but not otherwise.

Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—I think it is relevant to the Demand before the House. In trying to give a grant for industrial development, what I have been trying to impress upon the Government is that this department of industries has not been able to bestow as much attention as it should have done. That is my suggestion. This department should be more dynamic. It should not be very rigid.

Sri S. SHIVAPPA.—On a point of procedure.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is it a point of order or of procedure ?

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—I rise to a point of order. On the Demand, the Leader of the Opposition opened the debate. Therefore the debate should be continued by the Leader of the Opposition. But we find that another member is speaking even before Sri Shivappa concluded. That is why here is this objection.